

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

10-24-2011

Service-learning: a study of faculty attitudes at Rowan University

Rhiannon Napoli

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you -
share your thoughts on our feedback form.**

Recommended Citation

Napoli, Rhiannon, "Service-learning: a study of faculty attitudes at Rowan University" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations*. 103.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/103>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

SERVICE-LEARNING: A STUDY OF FACULTY ATTITUDES

AT ROWAN UNIVERSITY

by
Rhiannon Napoli

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
June 23, 2011

Thesis Chair: Burton R. Sisco, Ed.D.

© 2011 Rhiannon Napoli

ABSTRACT

Rhiannon Napoli
SERVICE-LEARNING: A STUDY OF FACULTY ATTITUDES
AT ROWAN UNIVERSITY

Rhiannon Napoli
2010/11
Burton Sisco, Ed.D.
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty members' service-learning attitudes and experiences at Rowan University, specifically attitudes towards the benefits of service-learning, faculty motivation for service-learning, and institutional support for service-learning. This study also examined reasons for the incorporation of service into a faculty members' curriculum, faculty members' attitudes toward possible outcomes associated with students and service-learning, as well as relationships between faculty demographics and attitudes toward service-learning. The researcher surveyed 172 faculty members at Rowan University during spring 2011. Data were collected using a 40-item survey instrument that utilized Likert scales. The collected data were statistically analyzed to determine frequencies, percentages, correlations, and statistical significance. The analysis of the data generally suggested that faculty members agreed that there were benefits to service-learning and that they would like to incorporate service-learning into their courses, although few have done so in the past. The faculty members also reported that they lacked the institutional, departmental, and financial support in order to implement service-learning into their courses.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the following individuals for their help with this research:

Dr. Burton Sisco- for his help and support throughout this research process.

Thank you for your patience, attention to detail, and general devotion to the field of higher education and its students.

My parents, Mary and Andrew- for their understanding, support, and love throughout my graduate education and life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
Appendixes	vi
List of Tables	vii
CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Significance of the Study	2
Operational Definitions	2
Assumptions and Limitations	3
Research Questions	4
Overview of the Study	5
II. Literature Review	6
Service-Learning Defined	6
History of Service-Learning	7
Experiential Learning and Service-Learning	8
Best Practices	8
Involvement, Engagement, and Service-Learning	10
Faculty-Mandated Service-Learning Critiques	12
Faculty-Mandated Service-Learning Support	13
Attitudes	15

	Faculty Attitudes Towards Service Learning at Various Institutions	16
	Summary of the Literature Review	20
III.	Methodology	22
	Context of the Study	22
	Population and Sample Selection	23
	Instrumentation	23
	Data Collection	26
	Data Analysis	27
IV.	Findings	28
	Profile of the Sample	28
	Analysis of the Data	31
	Research Question 1	31
	Research Question 2	37
	Research Question 3	38
	Research Question 4	39
	Research Question 5	41
V.	Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	44
	Summary of the Study	44
	Discussion of the Findings	45
	Conclusions	53
	Recommendations for Practice	54
	Recommendations for Further Research	55

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Institutional Review Board Approval Letter	60
Appendix B: Community Service Attitudes Scale	62
Appendix C: Service-Learning: An Examination of Community College Faculty Attitudes, Integration of Services, and Institutional Support Survey Instrument	67
Appendix D: Survey Instrument	73

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
4.1	Demographics	29
4.2	Faculty Attitudes Toward Enhancement Features of Service-Learning	32
4.3	Faculty Motivation Toward the Integration of Service into the Curriculum	34
4.4	Faculty Attitudes Toward Institutional Support for Service-Learning	35
4.5	Have You Ever Implemented Service-Learning into Your Classroom?	37
4.6	How Often Do You Implement Service-Learning?	37
4.7	Rank of Reasons for Teaching a Service-Learning Course	38
4.8	Correlation between Faculty Demographics and Faculty Attitudes Toward Service-Learning	40
4.9	Possible Student Outcomes Associated with Service-Learning	42

CHAPTER I

Introduction

A great deal of research exists in the area of service-learning on college campuses. The research conducted by Eyler and Giles (1994), Eyler, Giles, and Schmiede (1996), Astin, Vogelgesand, Ikeda, and Yee (2000), and Corporation for National Service (2001) suggest that service learning leads to racial understanding, personal development, enhanced leadership skills, pro-social values, future volunteer efforts, reflective learning, higher graduation rates, higher levels of student satisfaction, higher retention rates, and improved town and gown relations. However, less research has been conducted on faculty attitudes toward service-learning (Godwin, 2002). This study sought to present empirical evidence of faculty attitudes toward service-learning at a four-year, public institution in southern New Jersey.

Statement of the Problem

While a great deal of research exists on student attitudes toward service-learning, there is little research presented on faculty attitudes towards the practice (Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994). Additionally, there is no research on faculty attitudes toward service-learning at Rowan University. Many colleges and universities hope that faculty members will institute service-learning into their curriculum. However, despite overwhelming research in favor of service-learning, many faculty classrooms do not employ a service-learning pedagogy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty members' service-learning attitudes and experiences at Rowan University, specifically attitudes towards the benefits of service-learning, faculty motivation for service-learning, and institutional support for

service-learning. This study also examined reasons for the incorporation of service into a faculty members' curriculum, faculty members' attitudes toward possible outcomes associated with students and service-learning, as well as relationships between faculty demographics and attitudes toward service-learning.

Significance of the Study

Increasing numbers of colleges and universities are implementing service-learning into their classes. Some academic institutions have even begun to mandate that all students complete a service-learning program before they are permitted to graduate (Bennet, 2009; Metz & Youniss, 2005). As more institutions implement service-learning programs, it is necessary to examine faculty attitudes surrounding service-learning as well as the reasons that inhibit or enable faculty implementation. This study provides information including faculty attitudes toward service-learning and faculty attitudes toward institutional support and motivation for service-learning integration.

Operational Definitions

1. Attitude: A psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).
2. Belief: A person's location on a probability dimension that links and object and an attribute (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975).
3. Community Service Attitude Scale: A survey instrument used to measure attitudes of a certain population towards community service (Shiarella, McCarthy, & Tucker, 2000).
4. Enhancement Features: Benefits of service-learning (Carter, 2004).
5. Experiential Learning: Process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience (Kolb, 1984).
6. Faculty Members: A professor at a college or university. For the purposes of this study, all faculty members are professors at Rowan University during the spring of 2011.

7. Involvement: Refers to the amount of physical and psychological energy that a student devotes to the academic experience (Astin, 1984).
8. Mandatory: A requirement that a student must meet before he or she can officially graduate from the institution.
9. Motivation: An internal state or condition that activates and gives direction to thoughts, feelings, and actions (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).
9. Objects: Astin (1984) refers to objects as anything into which students invest their energy. They can be general such as the overall student experience or specific such as preparing for a class presentation. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) refer to objects as anything that a person can have an attitude towards; a person, thing, activity, idea, place, etc.
10. Program: When related to service-learning, a broad overall practice of the university.
11. Project: When related to service-learning, one specific community-service activity or event.
12. Service-Learning: “A teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities,” (Learn and Serve America: National Service Learning Clearinghouse, n.d., para. 1).
13. Tenure-Line: An assistant, associate, or tenured-level faculty member at Rowan University.

Assumptions and Limitations

The scope of this study was limited to the faculty members at Rowan University. It was assumed that all faculty members who participated in the study were familiar with the idea of service-learning. The findings of this study were self-reported and were

limited by the honesty of the participants. The attitudes reported were of the participants during the spring 2011 academic term.

The composition of the sample is also a limitation. Only tenure-line faculty members (assistant, associate, and full professors) were surveyed. The total population of tenure-line faculty members at Rowan University is 344. Out of the 344 potential participants, 50% or 172 subjects were selected at random to participate in this study.

A potential for researcher bias exists given that she has been involved with service-learning projects both as an undergraduate and graduate student. She is also employed by the university as the Graduate Coordinator for Student Activities; however in her position as the Graduate Coordinator she has limited contact with faculty members.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the attitudes of selected faculty members at Rowan University towards service-learning?
2. What are the service-learning teaching experiences of selected faculty members at Rowan University?
3. How do faculty members rank various reasons for incorporating service-learning into their classrooms at Rowan University?
4. Is there a significant relationship between faculty demographics and attitudes towards service-learning?
5. What outcomes do selected faculty members associate with service-learning?

Overview of the Study

Chapter II discusses the literature related to service-learning. In Chapter II, service-learning is defined and information is presented on the history of service-learning, service-learning as a form of experiential learning, best practices for service-learning, and how service-learning fits into higher education development theories and models. Research is also presented on faculty mandated service-learning programs, faculty attitudes toward community service at particular institutions and the *Community Service Attitudes Scale* (Shiarella, McCarthy, & Tucker, 2000).

Chapter III presents the methodology and procedures used to conduct the study including a description of the study, population and sample, data collection instruments, and how the data were analyzed. The results and findings of the research are discussed in Chapter IV. A summary, discussion, recommendations, and conclusion of the study are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

The implementation of service-learning at higher education institutions suggests there are many benefits to the programs. The research conducted by Eyler and Giles (1994), Eyler, Giles, and Schmiede (1996), Astin, Vogelgesand, Ikeda and Yee (2000), and Corporation for National Service (2001) identifies the many benefits to service-learning. Still, little research has been conducted on faculty attitudes toward service-learning (Godwin, 2002; Hou, 2010). This chapter focuses on what is service-learning, the history of service-learning, service-learning as a form of experiential learning, best practices for service-learning, how service-learning fits into higher education development theories and, how attitudes are formed, faculty attitudes toward community service at particular institutions, and the *Community Service Attitudes Scale* (Shiarella, McCarthy, & Tucker, 2000).

Service-Learning Defined

The National Service Learning Clearinghouse defines service-learning as “a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities,” (Learn and Serve America: National Service Learning Clearinghouse, n.d., ¶1). Jacoby (1996) and Boyer (1990) applied the term to higher education. Jacoby's (1996) definition presents service-learning as a form of experiential education in which students take part in activities that deal with individual and communal needs together with planned opportunities intentionally created to facilitate student

learning and growth. Boyer (1990) stated that “Service is not just something students do in their spare time; it connects back to the core curriculum and the search for shared values” (p. 26).

History of Service-Learning

The definitions of service-learning today are built upon the ideas of John Dewey. Dewey (1900) presented the idea of reflective learning in his book *The School and Society, The Child and the Curriculum*. Reflective learning is the foundational idea from which service-learning was conceived. Additionally, the American philosopher, William James, wrote an essay titled “The Moral Equivalent of War,” in which he conceptualized a population of youth giving a certain number of years to a non-military service. By 1933, James’ concept was realized with the creation of the Civilian Conservation Core (CCC) by President Roosevelt. The CCC was developed for millions of young Americans to serve terms of six to 18 months to provide service to the country while supporting their families and themselves. In 1944, the Servicemen Readjustment Act linked service and learning by offering citizens a formal education in return for service to their country (Learn and Serve America: National Service Learning Clearinghouse, n.d.).

However, the term, “service-learning” was not used until 1966 when a group of eastern Tennessee college students performed community service work with development organizations in the area. More recently, in 1992, the Maryland state government required all of the state’s high school students to participate in service-learning as a requirement for graduation (Learn and Serve America: National Service Learning Clearinghouse, n.d.). Many American schools have since followed suit by mandating community service and utilizing the experiential learning model (Speck & Hoppe, 2004).

Experiential Learning and Service-Learning

Service-learning is considered a form of experiential learning. The model of experiential learning was introduced by David A. Kolb in 1984. The model presents experiential learning as a “process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (p. 38). Kolb states that learning occurs in a four-stage cycle. The first stage is a concrete experience such as the action performed while serving. The next stage is reflective observation, which could be fostered through reflective discussions during and after each service experience. The third stage is abstract conceptualization or applying the ideas and concepts learned through the experience and reflective observation to a new situation. The final stage is active experimentation by putting the new concepts into action.

Ord (2009) provides a critique of Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning model, stating that in recent years the term “concrete experience” has been misused. Ord argues that a “lived experience,” a term conceived out of Dewey’s (1900) work, is a more appropriate condition for learning to take place. The difference between the two terms is that a concrete experience is the action of some activity. According to Kolb, after this activity has taken place and a subsequent reflective discussion has occurred, learning may occur. In contrast, a lived experience is a “dual process of understanding and influencing the world around us, as well as being influenced and changed ourselves by the experience,” (Ord, 2009, p. 1).

Best Practices

Over the years service-learning practitioners have adapted the experiential education cycle to best fit service-learning. Different models and practices were employed and tested. In 1989 the Johnson Foundation hosted a Wingspread Conference

during which the *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning* were presented. The principals are a result of a two-year process that involved over 75 national and regional service-learning and experiential education organizations. The Principles have since been viewed as the foundation for all effective service-learning programs. The practices are outlined below:

1. An effective program engages people in responsible and challenging actions for the common good.
2. An effective program provides opportunities for people to reflect critically on their service experience.
3. An effective program articulates clear service and learning goals for everyone involved.
4. An effective program allows for those with need to define those needs.
5. An effective program clarifies the responsibilities of each person and organization involved.
6. An effective program matches service providers and service needs through a process that recognizes changing circumstances.
7. An effective program expects genuine, active, and sustained, organizational commitment.
8. An effective program includes training, supervision, monitoring, support, recognition, and evaluation to meet service and learning goals.
9. An effective program ensures that the time commitment for service and learning is flexible, appropriate, and in the best interest of all involved.
10. An effective program is committed to program participation by and with diverse populations. (Honnet & Poulen, 1989, pp. 1-2)

The practices that are outlined above are presented as guidelines for college and university faculty members to engage students in service-learning programs (Honnet & Poulen, 1989). Further investigation is needed as to why faculty members choose to or not to utilize the practices.

Involvement, Engagement, and Service-Learning

Service-learning is used at many institutions as a way to involve and engage students (Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). Astin (1984) defines student involvement as the physical and mental energy that a student puts into his/her educational career.

Involvement in this case is defined in behavioral terms. Astin's Student Involvement Theory presents a highly involved student as one who spends a good deal of time and energy on studying, being on campus, participating in student clubs or organizations, and interacting with faculty and staff members (Astin, 1984).

Astin describes the Student Involvement Theory as having five postulates that are outlined below:

1. Involvement is an investment of both physical and psychological energy in various objects.
2. Involvement happens along a continuum. Different students give varying amounts of time to different objects. The same student can give different amounts of involvement to different objects at different times.
3. Involvement can be measured both qualitatively and quantitatively.
4. The amount of student learning in a given program is directly related to the amount of student involvement in that program.
5. The effectiveness of any educational policy or practice is related to that policy or practice's ability to increase student involvement. (Astin, 1984, p. 298)

Many of the characteristics that define a “highly involved student” and the Student Involvement Theory postulates can be achieved through a successful service-learning program. Astin (1984) notes further that if a faculty member simply exposes a student to a curriculum or experience the intervention may not provide the desired learning outcome. However, if an adequate amount of student effort and energy (student involvement) is given, such as through a service opportunity and subsequent reflective discussion, a positive learning outcome can be achieved.

In his later article, *What Matters in College* (1993), Astin discussed how particular college environments affected student outcomes. A longitudinal study of undergraduate students at over 200 colleges and universities was conducted over a four-year period. The acts of discussing courses with other students, working in groups, tutoring other students, and participating in clubs and organizations were measured and had positive effects on leadership, academic development, problem-solving, critical thinking skills, and cultural awareness. All of the aforementioned acts are similar to what Eyler and Giles (1999) and Honnet and Poulen (1989) described as part of a successful service-learning program.

Kuh (1995) discussed the idea of the “out-of-classroom” experience and how it relates to learning and personal development. He found that many types of out-of-classroom experiences could lead to student development. However, the most valuable experience was found to be one that needed continued effort to accomplish tasks while working with people of different backgrounds, such as a service-learning experience. Kuh states that “out-of-class experiences presented students with personal and social challenges; encouraged them to develop more complicated views on personal, academic,

and other matters; and provided opportunities for synthesizing and integrating material presented in the formal academic program,” (p. 146).

Based on the research by Kuh (1995) and the data collected from the *National Survey of Student Engagement* (NSSE), there are four practices that have a significant, positive influence on students at college and universities. Service-learning has been identified as one of these “high-impact practices” for successful campus learning programs. According to the report, students who participate in service-learning display increased moral reasoning, civic responsibility, and social justice orientation as well as a commitment to pursuing a service career in the future. These students also were more able to apply classroom lessons to real-world situations (Brownell & Swaner, 2009).

All of the information given above presents service-learning in a positive manner. It is difficult to argue that there are negative or adverse effects of a service-learning program. However, some faculty-mandated programs have shown some opposing results than those mentioned above.

Faculty-Mandated Service-Learning Critiques

Self-determination theory presents the idea that autonomy is a basic human need. According to the self-determination theory, autonomy reflects one’s own will by the acts that the individual carries out. By instituting mandatory service-learning programs faculty members are removing the chance for students to utilize their own free will, thus denying them a basic human need. By denying students a basic human need to choose their actions of service or volunteerism, faculty members are adversely affecting students (Ryan & Deci, 2006).

A study of 434 business and psychology undergraduate students in 1993 found that students who felt that their behavior was controlled by a required service-learning

program were less likely to volunteer in the future. The study also found that when an individual's agenda for volunteering is different than that of the institution requiring the mandatory volunteerism, future intentions for volunteer experiences may be altered. The study suggests that the best scenario for continued service and volunteerism is for students to choose to participate in service-learning on their own (Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999).

In addition to the denial of one's free will when service-learning is mandatory, there limited research that supports the long-term effectiveness of service-learning on students (Godwin, 2002). Godwin suggests that although there is research to support positive outcomes from service-learning experiences, service-learning depends on values education. He proposes that values acquisition is difficult to measure. Godwin suggests that values education assumes that by teaching the values- students have acquired the knowledge and will therefore put these values into practice. However, Godwin argues that simple knowledge of the values does not guarantee a change in a student's behavior.

This reinforces Astin's (1984) statement that simply exposing a student to a curriculum is not enough to produce a desired learning outcome. Additionally, Rozycki (1994) stated that a value will not affect one's behavior unless knowledge, ability, opportunity, and priority are all present. Without all four provisions, a value most likely will not manifest itself in a behavioral form. Godwin (2002) proposed that many faculty members implement service-learning programs in their classrooms on assumptions that values education leads to values implementation in students.

Faculty-Mandated Service-Learning Support

However, some research does support the idea of mandatory service programs. An additional study of college students conducted by Eyler and Giles (1994) looked at

the impact of a required community service lab on student's personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. Twenty-nine out of 57 of the students involved in the study reported that the most important learned outcome was a commitment to social service. An additional 15 students noted that the lab had helped them to reduce stereotypes.

When asked about their greatest personal accomplishment, 23 stated that it was providing service to another, and 19 students said that it was an increase in their skills of providing service or their knowledge about social issues. Thirty of the 57 students said that they had a greater understanding of those that they worked with and 13 students said that they gained understanding of volunteer service. This study suggests that there are some beneficial outcomes of faculty-mandated service-learning programs. Eyler and Giles (1994), however noted that their study lacked a control group and therefore it could not rule out other factors contributing to the positive outcomes.

More recent research expands on Eyler and Giles (1994) work by providing a control group and conducting longitudinal studies. In a study conducted in Ontario, Canada of two groups of high school seniors, one required to complete a community service and one not required to do so, researchers made an argument for mandatory service programs. Using the group who did not have to complete service as the control the researchers tackled some of the concerns of early researchers (Godwin, 2002; Rozycki, 1994; Stukas et al., 1999). The study found that students whose teacher's required them to complete service hours had the same attitudes and perspectives about community engagement as the control group. The study also discovered that service for any length of time was related to one's subsequent attitude to volunteer again and did not lessen the student's internal interest in volunteering (Henderson, Brown, Pancer, & Ellis-Hale, 2007).

Two studies conducted by Metz and Youniss (2003; 2005) reported data showing that high school students who were required to do service maintained interest for service in the future. Their longitudinal study (Metz & Youniss, 2005) studied 465 high school students at three points in time; the beginning of the junior year, the end of their junior year, and the end of their senior year. The findings suggest that students who were not already inclined to serve benefited from a required service program because it afforded them “a novel opportunity to experience themselves as responsible civic actors,” (Metz & Youniss, 2005, p. 431).

In another study, conducted with urban high school seniors, the author found a mandatory service-learning program successful in implementing of values in their students. At first the program did not produce the desired outcome of higher levels of civic engagement for their students. After the addition of a mentoring component to the program, the learning outcomes were achieved and the program deemed a success (Bennet, 2009).

It should be noted that not all high school students recognize these values initially. A study of a diverse group of college students looked at the supposed outcomes related to a high school service-learning graduation requirement. The authors of this study found that there was a tenuous relationship between high school service and involvement in college. Students stated that at the time of the service they saw the requirement as a burden. After some time, they perceived the service experience as being beneficial and recognized the value of what they did (Jones, Segar, & Gasioriski, 2008).

Attitudes

Albarracin, Johnson, and Zanna (2005) state that hundreds of definitions exist for the term “attitude.” For the purposes of this study, Eagly and Chaiken’s (1993) definition

of attitude was used. They stated that attitude is “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor,” (p. 1).

Attitudes are formed by a person’s experiences that led to their beliefs about particular objects, people or events. (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). The beliefs are the effect of a direct observation or an interpretation of another person’s views. Beliefs can be held over time or may be changed from a new experience or event. Throughout time a person may have a number of different beliefs about one particular object, however at any one moment in time on a relatively few number of beliefs manifest themselves into an attitude about said object. Fishbein and Ajzen argued that only five to nine beliefs made up one’s attitude toward a certain object at any one time.

Just as there are many definitions of attitude, there are a great number of measurement instruments to determine attitudes. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) found nearly 500 different instruments used to measure attitudes in a review of research just between the years of 1968 and 1970. There are three different categories of measuring attitude- direct, in-direct, and physiological. Direct measurements include methods such as Likert scales which ask participants to rate their level of agreement along a scale from low to high. Likert scales usually ask level of agreement, comfort, like, frequency, or satisfaction, etc. Indirect measurement refers to methods of data collection such as reaction or behavior observation. Physiological measurement is the method of recording a subject’s physical responses to questions to determine their level of comfort or distress with the particular topic.

Faculty Attitudes Towards Service Learning at Various Institutions

A few studies have been conducted at other institutions regarding faculty attitudes toward service learning. At the Colorado School of Mines, a study was conducted in the fall of 2004 by Bauer, Moskal, Gosink, Lucena, and Munoz (2007). Both faculty and

students were surveyed to determine their attitudes toward a service-learning program. The study employed the use of the *Community Service Attitudes Scale*, developed by Shiarella, McCarthy, and Tucker (2000). The CSAS (Appendix B) combined its scales into eight different factor groups. The groups were as follows: actions, ability, and norms; connectedness; costs; awareness and empathy; intention to engage in helping behavior; other benefits; seriousness; and career benefits. Both students and faculty members rated the various scale items on a one-through seven-point Likert-type scale with one meaning “extremely unlikely” and seven meaning “extremely likely” in the Bauer et al. study (2007). A total of 34 faculty members and 78 students responded to the survey. The means of the faculty scores were as follows:

I. Actions, Ability & Norms	5.77
II. Connectedness	5.23
III. Costs	3.80
IV. Awareness & Empathy	5.67
V. Intention to Engage in Helping Behavior	5.43
VI. Other Benefits	5.46
VII. Seriousness	4.89
VIII. Career Benefits	3.27

The faculty members displayed more favorable attitudes toward service-learning than students in all of the factors of the CSAS except career benefits. This could be due to the fact that more faculty members are established in their jobs than students.

Bulot and Johnson (2006), sought to determine the rewards and costs of faculty participation with a service-learning project. A total of 42 faculty members responded to a 29-question survey that was different from the CSAS instrument. Bulot and Johnson’s

survey instrument was developed in consultation with the participants from the Intergenerational Service Learning group.

The study found that there were three “costs” or difficult factors when implements a service-learning component into a class. The costs were the various student experiences and needs, difficult community partners, and that service-learning was time-consuming. However, there were also rewards associated with service-learning. The researchers found that faculty members learned from implementing service-learning into their classes and the experience also made teaching more rewarding and enriching for them. Bulot and Johnson found that 97.5% of respondents would teach a service-learning course in the future, 100% indicated that a service-learning course takes more “time and effort” than a traditional course, 54% said that lack of institutional support was a problem, 81% stated that they lacked the monetary support to conduct proper service-learning project, and 78% said that they lacked recognition for their efforts (Bulot & Johnson, 2006).

A study conducted by Clara Giles Carter (2004) examined community college faculty attitudes toward service-learning in her doctoral dissertation entitled “Service-Learning: An Examination of Community College Faculty Attitudes, Integration of Services, and Institutional Support.” The study included a survey of 1220 full-time faculty members at 12 different community colleges in Maryland. The author found that there are three main conditions that keep faculty members from incorporating service-learning into their curriculum. The conditions are: lack of institutional support, faculty reluctance to shift in their teaching style from teaching to learning, and the misunderstanding of faculty members as to the level of scholarship associated with service-learning pedagogy.

Carter (2004) examined faculty demographics to see if there was a relationship between selected demographics and attitudes toward student enhancement features of service-learning. Age, race, and sex were all found to be statistically significant ($p=.047$, $p=.006$, and $p=.042$, respectively). The findings suggested that older, white males were less in favor of the student enhancement features of service-learning. The qualitative data from this study showed that older, white males felt this way because they did not see this form of experiential learning as a beneficial teaching methodology.

Carter's (2004) study also found that the highest levels of motivation to incorporate service-learning into the classroom came from faculty with the least amount of status. In this study those with lower status included females, faculty of color, and faculty with lower-academic ranks. The results indicated that those who have already implemented service into their curriculum taught in the following areas: health, history, human services, nursing, psychology, and sociology among others. The responses also indicated that those who participated in service activities on their own, regardless of their academic field, were more motivated to include service-learning in their courses.

The data from Carter's (2004) study suggested that if the institution has a service requirement for students, faculty believe the institution supports service-learning. Carter also noted that younger respondents (35 years old or younger) with a lower academic rank felt that the institution supports service-learning more so than the older higher-ranking faculty members. The data showed that few incentives, such as grants or release time, were provided for faculty if service-learning was incorporated into their classes. The data implied that if there were no institutional support of service-learning programs, faculty would be apprehensive to integrate the pedagogy into their curriculum (Carter, 2004).

Summary of the Literature Review

Overall, the literature shows that there are many benefits to service-learning (Astin et al., 2000; Bennet, 2009; Corporation for National Service, 2001; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Metz & Youniss, 2005) and that service-learning has been shown to be a large part of student development theories and models (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 1995). While there is some critique of mandatory service-learning programs (Rozycki 1994; Ryan & Deci, 2006; Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999;), some recent research has discovered that service-learning does have a few long term benefits such as higher levels of civic engagement (Bennet 2009; Metz & Youniss, 2005). It is difficult to deny the benefits of well-executed service-learning programs.

Despite all of the literature in favor of service-learning (Astin et al., 2000; Bennet, 2009; Corporation for National Service, 2001; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Metz & Youniss, 2005), service-learning's connection to historical student development theories (Astin 1984; Kuh 1995), extensive research on service-learning best practices, and the recent research that shows long term benefits of service-learning (Bennet 2009; Metz & Youniss, 2005) few universities require service-learning in the classroom and faculty do not play a central part in the service-learning experience (Bulot & Johnson, 2006).

Additionally, there seems to be little research of faculty attitudes and experiences with service-learning (Hou, 2010; Kuh, Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnek, 1994). Thus, further investigation is needed to determine faculty attitudes towards service-learning. This study sought to discover what the faculty attitudes toward service-learning are, present the experiences of faculty members with service-learning, rank possible reasons for incorporating service-learning into the classroom, determine if there was a relationship between certain faculty demographics and attitudes toward service-learning,

and present data on faculty attitudes of outcomes associated with service-learning.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Context of the Study

This study was conducted at Rowan University. Rowan University is a four-year, public liberal arts institution located in Glassboro, NJ. Founded in 1923, Rowan University began as Glassboro Normal School, a school for teacher training in the southern New Jersey area. By 1958, the curriculum had been expanded to include several more disciplines of study and the school's name was changed to Glassboro State College to reflect the additional program offerings. In 1992, a 100 million dollar gift from industrialist, Henry Rowan and his wife Betty, led to the school's current name of Rowan University.

Presently Rowan is separated into six academic colleges: Business, Communication, Education, Engineering, Fine & Performing Arts, Liberal Arts & Sciences, and has a College of Graduate and Continuing Education. Rowan is home to just over 10,000 students, 80 undergraduate majors, 26 master's degree programs and a doctorate in educational leadership.

Rowan's mission statement says that the school "combines liberal education with professional preparation... [and] provides a collaborative, learning-centered environment in which highly qualified and diverse faculty, staff, and students integrate teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and community service," (Welcome to Rowan University, 2008, paragraph 8). Rowan University's faculty is comprised of 344 tenured-line professors. Tenured-line faculty members include assistant-level professors, associate-level professors, and full professors.

Population and Sample Selection

The target population for this study was all tenure-line faculty members in the United States. The available populations included tenure-line faculty members at Rowan University during the 2010-2011 academic year. A convenience sample of 50% tenure-line faculty members (assistant, associate, and full professors) was taken from the available 344 tenure-line faculty members at Rowan. The 172 faculty members were chosen at random from a list of professors that was obtained from the Rowan University Provost Office.

Instrumentation

Part of the survey instrument for this study was based off of The *Community Service Attitudes Scale* (Shiarella, McCarthy, & Tucker, 2000). The *Community Service Attitude Scale* (CSAS) was created and validated by Shiarella, McCarthy, and Tucker (2000). CSAS is based on the *Altruistic Helping Behavior Model* that was developed by Schwartz (1977) and Schwartz and Howard (1984). Schwartz's model is divided into four phases. The first phase presents a person's awareness of community's need for service. The second phase reflects a belief that an individual feels morally obligated to help this need in the community. The next phase is an evaluation of the cost and rewards of acting on that feeling of obligation. The final phase is the action that an individual would take to respond to the community need. Theoretically, an individual would move through each phase sequentially before entering the final stage and performing the service. Each of these phases is measured through questions on the CSAS. The questions are designed to measure the level to which an individual agrees or disagrees with a given statement.

Originally, the survey had 70 items. A second version of the survey was developed that was comprised of 31 community-service attitude items, seven

demographic items, and three items on intention to engage in service in the future. The instrument was tested for reliability and validity. The participants rated the items on the CSAS on a one-through seven-point Likert-type scale with one meaning “extremely unlikely” and seven meaning “extremely likely.”

The CSAS statements formed the following eight different factor groupings: actions, ability and norms, connectedness, costs, awareness and empathy, intention to engage in helping behavior, other benefits, seriousness and career benefits. Each of the factor groupings were measured for their reliability and validity. Shiarella et al. (2000) found that the scales of the CSAS showed strong reliability evidence with the coefficient alphas ranging from .72 to .93. The researchers also completed a principal components analysis. The construct validity of the CSAS was assessed by analyzing the relationships between each scale and the demographic information collected from the instrument. There was no substantial relationship of age, race, or rank to the scales. However, the researchers did find that the scales were positively correlated with gender, college major, community service experience, and intentions to engage in community service. These findings were consistent with the Schwartz (1977) model.

The complete second version of the CSAS is found in Appendix B. Only the demographic information and the section of questions that asked for information about outcomes of service-learning were adapted for this study. The CSAS placed their survey items into eight factor groupings. Only 12 of the original 31 CSAS items were appropriate to include in the survey instrument for this study. Therefore the factor groupings were not used and each item was listed separately along with the mean, standard deviation, frequency (*f*), and percentage (%) in chapter IV. The 12 items that were chosen all deal with outcomes associated with service-learning. A reliability

analysis was conducted on these 12 items to determine their consistency. Cronbach's Alpha was determined to be .627, signifying a moderate level of internal consistency.

Most of the remaining questions of the survey instrument for this study was based on an instrument created by Clara Giles Carter (2004) for an unpublished doctoral dissertation entitled "Service-Learning: An Examination of Community College Faculty Attitudes, Integration of Services, and Institutional Support" which is found in Appendix C. Carter modified two instruments to create her survey instrument. The first was an instrument that was designed by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA that was titled *The Service Orientation Prediction 1995-96 Heri-Survey*. The second instrument was based on a survey that was used in research by Antonio, Astin, and Cress (2000) in their study entitled *Community Service in Higher Education: A Look at the Nation's Faculty*.

Carter (2004) analyzed the scale reliability and found that it was above .70. The validity of the instrument was determined through a factor analysis. The Varimax and Kaiser Normalization rotation method was utilized. Carter placed each of the scales into one of three factor groupings (faculty attitudes toward enhancement features of service-learning, faculty motivation toward the integration of service into the curriculum, and faculty attitudes toward institutional support for service-learning) and analyzed each factor separately. This allowed the researcher to assume that each factor was not correlated with as well as independent of the other factor scales that were constructed. The factors' Cronbach's Alphas were .83, .75, and .74, respectively.

Carter (2004) identified three research domains for her study. The first domain was faculty attitudes toward enhancement features of service-learning. The second was faculty motivation toward the integration of service into the curriculum and the third domain was faculty attitudes toward institutional support for service-learning. Each

domain included items from the survey instrument used for this study. The exact wordings of some items were slightly changed to accommodate the participants of this study, such as the word “college” to the word “university.” Also, a few scale items were added by me to gain further insight and placed in the appropriate domain. Some of the added items were based on items from the Bulot and Johnson (2006) study; specifically survey items 34-38. Domain 1 includes survey items 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, and 40. Domain 2 includes survey items 24, 30, 33, 34, 35, and 39. Finally, domain 3 includes survey items 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, and 38.

The instrument created for this study contains five items on demographics, two items on experience with service-learning in their classroom, 11 items on possible student outcomes associated with service-learning, 21 items on faculty attitudes towards service-learning, and one item ranking the reasons for teaching a service-learning course. The survey was distributed to faculty members via a link to an online version of the instrument. Surveymonkey.com was used to build and host the online version. A full copy of the survey instrument used for this study is found in Appendix D.

The survey instrument for this study was distributed to 5 faculty members and graduate students as a pilot-test. This determined if there was anything in the survey that was unclear or could be misinterpreted. This provided face validity for the study.

An Institutional Review Board (IRB) application was submitted and approved in the fall of 2011 to ensure the rights of each subject (Appendix A).

Data Collection

Faculty member e-mail addresses were obtained with consent from the Rowan University Provost’s Office. Out of the 344 eligible tenured-line faculty members, 50 percent or 172 faculty members were chosen to participate. The survey (Appendix D) was distributed to each faculty member via e-mail. Included in the e-mail was a link to

an online survey that was posted on Surveymonkey.com. Participants were informed that the study was being conducted to fulfill a requirement for a master's thesis and consent was gained through the alternative consent procedure. Once the subjects had completed the test it was submitted and the results were compiled online. The subjects were given one week to complete the survey then a subsequent reminder e-mail was sent to encourage a higher return rate. After the fourth reminder was sent out, hard-copies were made available to those who did not already participate in the study. Involvement in the survey was voluntary. No identifying information was collected in order to ensure the participant's confidentiality.

Data Analysis

The information collected from the survey was analyzed using the Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) computer program. Faculty demographics were the independent variable and their attitudes were the dependant variables. Descriptive statistics provided frequencies, means, standard deviation, and percentages for the demographic information, attitudes, outcomes, reasons for teaching a service-learning course and the various service-learning experiences that the participants reported. A Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to determine if there was a relationship between the reported demographics and the attitudes in survey items 20-39. The data were then compared to previous data that was discussed in the literature review.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

Profile of the Sample

The subjects chosen for this study were tenure-line professors at Rowan University during the spring 2011 semester. The survey instrument was distributed to 172 faculty members who were chosen at random from the total faculty population of 344. A response rate of 52.33% was achieved as 90 faculty members completed the survey. There was one (1.1%) subject in the 22-30 years old age range, 22 (24.4%) in the 31-40 years old range, 23 (25.6%) in the 41-50 years old range, 23 (25.6%) in the 51-60 years old range, 19 (21.1%) in the 61-70 range, and one (1.1 %) in the 71 and over range. One subject chose not to answer the age question.

A total of 42 females (46.7%), 45 males (50%), two (2.2%) participants who chose not to disclose their gender, and one (1.1%) person skipped the gender question participated in the study. A total of four (4.4%) African-Americans (non-Hispanic) completed the survey along with nine (10%) Asian/Pacific Islanders, two (2.2%) Hispanic/Latinos, two (2.2%) multi-racial people, and 72 (80%) Whites. One (1.1%) participant chose not to answer the race question. There were 25 (27.8%) assistant professors, 37 (41.1%) associate professors, and 27 (30%) full professors. One (1.1%) subject chose not to answer the professorship demographic question. The participants were from a variety of colleges at Rowan University. There were 11 (12.2%) from Business, eight (8.9%) from Communications, 22 (24.4%) from Education, 11 (12.2%)

from Engineering, seven (7.8%) from Fine and Performing Arts, 30 (33.3%) from Liberal Arts and Sciences, and one (1.1%) from the College of Graduate and Continuing Studies.

Table 4.1

Demographics (N=90)

Item	Variable	<i>f</i>	%
Sex	Male	45	50
	Female	42	59.4
	Choose not to disclose	2	2.2
	Total	89	98.9
Age	22-30	1	1.1
	31-40	22	24.4
	41-50	23	25.6
	51-60	23	25.6
	61-70	19	21.1
	71 & over	1	1.1
	Total	89	98.8
Race	African-American	4	4.4
	Asian/Pacific Islander	9	10
	Hispanic/Latino	2	2.2

	Multi-Racial	2	2.2
	White (Non-Hispanic)	72	80.9
	Total	89	98.9
Level of Professorship	Assistant	25	27.8
	Associate	37	41.1
	Full	27	30
	Total	89	98.9
College	Business	11	12.2
	Communications	8	8.9
	Education	22	24.4
	Engineering	11	12.2
	Fine & Performing Arts	7	7.8
	Liberal Arts & Sciences	30	33.3
	Graduate & Continuing Studies	1	1.1
	Total	90	100

Analysis of the Data

Research Question 1: What are the attitudes of selected faculty members at Rowan University towards service-learning?

Survey items 20-39 asked subjects about their attitudes towards service-learning. These items were based on the three domains of Carter's (2004) research as well as Bulot and Johnson's (2006) study. The items from Bulot and Johnson's study were placed in the appropriate domain. The first domain was faculty attitudes toward enhancement features of service-learning, the second domain was faculty motivation toward the integration of service into the curriculum, and the third and final domain was faculty attitudes toward institutional support for service-learning. Domain 1 includes survey items 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, and 40. Domain 2 includes survey items 24, 30, 33, 34, 35, and 39. Finally, domain 3 includes survey items 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, and 38. The survey items are listed within their respective domains separately along with the mean, standard deviation, frequency (*f*) and percentage (%). The participants were given the options to respond by answering: "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Disagree," or "Strongly Disagree." A general look at the data suggests that faculty members typically agreed or strongly agreed with the perceived benefits of service-learning such as: "when service is integrated in course work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better," and "teaching service-learning helps to define student's personal strengths and weaknesses for faculty." Faculty generally disagreed or strongly disagreed with the following statements: "students learn more from a course when all time is spent in the classroom rather than doing service in the community" and "service activities beyond the institution are a distraction and compete with essential academic

work.” The highest “strongly agree” or “agree” response was 82.2% to the statement “a service-learning project would help my students apply course knowledge to real world situations.”

Table 4.2 provides information about faculty attitudes towards service-learning at Rowan within the first domain of faculty attitudes toward student enhancement features of service-learning.

Table 4.2

Faculty Attitudes Toward Enhancement Features of Service-Learning

Strongly Agree=4, Agree=3, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=1

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
A service-learning project would help my students apply course knowledge to real world situations. <i>n</i> =84, <i>M</i> =3.02, <i>SD</i> =.711	17	18.9	57	63.3	5	5.6	5	5.6
When service is integrated in course work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better. <i>n</i> =85, <i>M</i> =2.78, <i>SD</i> =.746	11	12.2	49	54.4	20	22.2	5	5.6
Teaching a service-learning course requires a change in teaching orientation. <i>n</i> =86, <i>M</i> =2.78, <i>SD</i> =.621	5	5.6	61	67.8	16	17.8	4	4.4

Service-learning can enhance my ability to communicate the core competencies of the subject matter I teach. <i>n</i> =88, <i>M</i> =2.77, <i>SD</i> =.813	13	14.4	50	55.6	17	18.9	8	8.9
Teaching service-learning helps to define student's personal strengths and weaknesses for faculty. <i>n</i> =83, <i>M</i> =2.54, <i>SD</i> =.631	2	2.2	45	50.0	32	35.6	4	4.4
Students learn more from a course when all time is spent in the classroom rather than doing service in the community. <i>n</i> =86, <i>M</i> =2.22, <i>SD</i> =.710	5	5.6	18	20.0	54	60.0	9	10.0
Service activities beyond the institution are a distraction and compete with essential academic work. <i>n</i> =85, <i>M</i> =2.14, <i>SD</i> =.726	4	4.4	17	18.9	51	56.7	13	14.4

Table 4.3 provides information about faculty attitudes towards service-learning at Rowan within the second domain of faculty motivation toward the integration of service into the curriculum. These data show that most faculty (73.4%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that “service-learning is important in faculty evaluation at this university.” The highest “strongly agree” or “agree” response was 80% to both the

statement “teaching a service-learning takes more time and effort than a traditional course,” and the statement “service-learning provides the opportunity for faculty to communicate new ideas in a real work context.”

Table 4.3

Faculty Motivation Toward the Integration of Service into the Curriculum
Strongly Agree=5, Agree=4, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=1

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Teaching a service-learning takes more time and effort than a traditional course. <i>n</i> =85, <i>M</i> =3.02, <i>SD</i> = .654	17	18.9	55	61.1	11	12.2	2	2.2
Service-learning provides the opportunity for faculty to communicate new ideas in a real work context. <i>n</i> =87, <i>M</i> =2.87, <i>SD</i> = .661	9	10.0	63	70.0	10	11.1	5	5.6
Participating in service-learning enhances my leadership skills. <i>n</i> =84, <i>M</i> =2.86, <i>SD</i> = .661	8	8.9	61	67.8	10	11.1	5	5.6
I would like to implement service-learning into my courses. <i>n</i> =88, <i>M</i> =2.74, <i>SD</i> = .780	11	12.2	50	55.6	20	22.2	7	7.8

I feel adequately prepared to implement service-learning into my courses. <i>n</i> =83, <i>M</i> =2.37, <i>SD</i> =.760	8	8.9	21	23.3	48	53.3	6	6.7
Service-learning is important in faculty evaluation at this university. <i>n</i> =88, <i>M</i> =2.23, <i>SD</i> =2.283	4	4.4	17	18.9	41	45.6	25	27.8

Table 4.4 provides information about faculty attitudes toward institutional support for service-learning. Generally faculty members disagreed or strongly disagreed with most of the statements with in this domain as demonstrated by Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Faculty Attitudes Toward Institutional Support for Service-Learning

Strongly Agree=5, Agree=4, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=1

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Teaching a service-learning course enhances career opportunities. <i>n</i> =86, <i>M</i> =2.60, <i>SD</i> =.674	3	3.3	52	57.8	25	27.8	6	6.7
Integrating service in the curriculum affords the instructor positive recognition within the university community. <i>n</i> =86, <i>M</i> =2.53, <i>SD</i> =.698	3	3.3	47	52.2	29	32.2	7	7.8

My department supports implementing service-learning into my courses. <i>n</i> =85, <i>M</i> =2.53, <i>SD</i> =.683	4	4.4	42	46.7	34	37.8	5	5.6
The university supports implementing service-learning into my courses. <i>n</i> =83, <i>M</i> =2.30, <i>SD</i> =.676	2	2.2	29	32.2	44	48.9	8	8.9
Service expectations are clearly articulated in institutional and departmental tenure/promotion policies at this university. <i>n</i> =87, <i>M</i> =2.07, <i>SD</i> =.8774	3	3.3	20	22.2	44	48.9	20	22.2
I have adequate financial resources in order to implement service-learning in my classroom. <i>n</i> =85, <i>M</i> =2.04, <i>SD</i> =.747	1	1.1	22	24.4	41	45.6	21	23.3
University administration recognizes service-learning as a scholarly contribution to the discipline. <i>n</i> =87, <i>M</i> =1.87, <i>SD</i> =.661	--	--	14	15.6	48	53.3	25	27.8
Integrating service-learning offers an instructor released time and/or other incentives. <i>n</i> =88, <i>M</i> =1.83, <i>SD</i> =.791	2	2.2	15	16.7	37	41.1	34	37.8

Research Question 2: What are the service-learning teaching experiences of selected faculty members at Rowan University?

Table 4.5 provides data on faculty members' experiences with teaching a course with a service-learning component. Thirty-one faculty members (34.4%) stated they had implemented service-learning into their classrooms before while 59 (65.6%) stated they had not implemented service-learning into their courses.

Table 4.5

Have You Ever Implemented Service-Learning into Your Classroom?
(N=90)

	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Yes	31	34.4
No	59	65.6
Total	90	100.0

Table 4.6 displays the data for the survey item that asked how often faculty members implement service-learning into their classes. Out of the 30 participants that completed this question, the highest response rate of 15 participants (16.7%) stated that they implemented service-learning "sporadically of the course of my career."

Table 4.6

How Often Do You Implement Service-Learning? (N=90)

	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Sporadically over the course of my career	15	16.7
Once a semester	11	12.2

Several times a semester	2	2.2
I mandate a semester long service-learning program for my students	2	2.2
Total	30	33.3

Research Question 3: How do faculty members rank various reasons for incorporating service-learning into their classrooms at Rowan University?

Subjects ranked seven reasons for incorporating service-learning into their classrooms in order of most important to least important. A ranking of “1” was considered the most important and “7” was considered the least important reason for implementing service into their courses. Table 4.7 shows the mean score of each reason and the ranking. With an average rank of 1.47, the most important reason that faculty members gave for teaching a service-learning course was “personal commitment to the community.”

Table 4.7

Rank of Reasons for Teaching a Service-Learning Course (N=90)

	<i>Reason</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Most Important	Personal commitment to the community	1.47	1
Next Most Important	Personal gratification	2.27	2
Next Most Important	Professional development	3.37	3
Next Most Important	Try something new	3.77	4
Next Most Important	Join other colleagues in using this form of instruction	4.26	5
Next Most Important	Faculty incentives	5.54	6
Least Important	Monetary rewards	6.61	7

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between faculty demographics and attitudes towards service-learning?

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between faculty demographics (survey items 1-5) and faculty attitudes of service-learning (survey items 20-39). This calculation determined if there were any significant relationships between those variables. Each of the five demographic items (age, gender, race, level of professorship, and college) are listed in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 displays any significant relationships between demographics and faculty attitudes of service-learning. All of the statements that had significant relationships with faculty age or gender had a weak, weak-moderate, or moderate correlation. A moderate positive relationship (Pearson $r = .347$, $p = .001$) was found between race and the statement “teaching a service-learning course results in a change in teaching orientation.” A moderate negative relationship (Pearson $r = -.333$, $p = .002$) was found between a faculty member’s level of professorship and the statement “teaching a service-learning course takes more time and effort than a traditional course.” A moderate negative relationship (Pearson $r = -.302$, $p = .005$) was found between college and the statement “when service is integrated into course work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better.” Finally, a moderate negative relationship (Pearson $r = -.378$, $p = .000$) was also found between college and the statement “my department supports implementing service-learning into my courses.”

Table 4.8

Correlation between Faculty Demographics and Faculty Attitudes Toward Service-Learning

Demographic	Statement	<i>f</i>	<i>r</i>	Sig. (2-tailed) <i>P</i> -value
Age	Students learn more from a course when all time is spent in the classroom rather than doing service to the community.	85	-.255*	.019
	Service activities beyond the institution are a distraction and compete with essential academic work.	84	-.267*	.014
	Teaching a service-learning course takes more time and effort than a traditional course.	84	-.261*	.017
Gender	Service-learning provides the opportunity for faculty to communicate new ideas in a real work context.	86	-.213*	.049
	Integrating service-learning offers an instructor released time and /or other incentives.	87	.254*	.017
	Teaching a service-learning course takes more time and effort than a traditional course.	84	-.241*	.027
Race	Teaching a service-learning course results in a change in teaching orientation.	85	.347**	.001
	Teaching service-learning helps to define students' personal strengths and weaknesses for faculty.	82	.244*	.027
Level of Professorship	Teaching a service-learning course takes more time and effort than a traditional course.	84	-.333**	.002
	I have adequate financial resources in order to implement service-learning in my classroom.	84	.232*	.034
College	Service-learning can enhance my ability to communicate the core competencies of the subject matter I teach.	88	-.286**	.007
	When service is integrated into course work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better.	85	-.302**	.005
	Teaching a service-learning course takes more time and effort than a traditional course.	85	.221*	.042
	Service activities beyond the institution are a distraction and compete with essential academic work.	85	.233*	.032
	I have adequate financial resources in order to implement service-learning into my classroom.	85	-.283**	.009

My department supports implementing service-learning into my courses.	85	-.378**	.000
I feel adequately prepared to implement service-learning into my courses.	83	-.221*	.045

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Research Question 5: What outcomes do selected faculty members associate with service-learning?

Table 4.9 provides data on faculty attitudes towards outcomes associated with service-learning. Faculty were asked to rate how likely they believed each outcome is to occur when a student completes a service-learning program or project on a seven-point Likert scale with “extremely unlikely” being one and “extremely likely” being seven. Faculty chose from the following responses for each statement: “extremely unlikely,” “quite unlikely,” “slightly unlikely,” “neither likely nor unlikely,” “slightly likely,” “quite likely,” and “extremely likely.” The statement “students would experience personal satisfaction knowing that they are helping others,” was rated the highest with a mean score of 5.67.

Table 4.9

Possible Student Outcomes Associated with Service-Learning

Extremely Unlikely=1, Quite Unlikely=2, Slightly Unlikely=3, Neither Likely Nor Unlikely= 4, Slightly Likely=5, Quite Likely=6, Extremely Likely=7

	Extremely Unlikely		Quite Unlikely		Slightly Unlikely		Neither Likely nor Unlikely		Slightly Likely		Quite Likely		Extremely Likely	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Students would experience personal satisfaction knowing that they are helping others. <i>n</i> =90, <i>M</i> =5.67, <i>SD</i> =1.298	2	2.2	4	4.4	2	2.2	--	--	13	14.4	54	60.0	15	16.7
Students would be contributing to the betterment of the community. <i>n</i> =88, <i>M</i> =5.66, <i>SD</i> =1.173	2	2.2	3	3.3	--	--	1	1.1	17	18.9	54	60.0	11	12.2
Students would be meeting other people who enjoy community service. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =5.58, <i>SD</i> =1.33	2	2.2	4	4.4	1	1.1	1	1.1	25	27.8	37	41.1	19	21.1
Students would be developing new skills. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =5.43, <i>SD</i> =1.453	5	5.6	2	2.2	1	1.1	5	5.6	17	18.9	47	52.2	12	13.3
Students would make valuable contacts for their professional careers. <i>n</i> =90, <i>M</i> =5.34, <i>SD</i> =4.381	2	2.2	1	1.1	6	6.7	16	17.8	38	42.2	22	24.4	4	4.4

Students would gain valuable experience for their resume. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =5.24, <i>SD</i> =1.438	3	3.3	4	4.4	5	5.6	--	--	36	40.0	27	30.0	14	15.6
Students would have less free time. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =3.88, <i>SD</i> =1.608	8	8.9	15	16.7	10	11.1	17	18.9	28	31.1	8	8.9	3	3.3
Students would have less time for their schoolwork. <i>n</i> =90, <i>M</i> =3.84, <i>SD</i> =1.357	4	4.4	12	13.3	18	20.0	27	30.0	19	21.1	9	10.0	1	1.1
Students would have less time to work. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =3.84, <i>SD</i> =1.537	7	7.8	15	16.7	9	10.0	25	27.8	23	25.6	7	7.8	3	3.3
Students would have less time to spend with families. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =3.62, <i>SD</i> =1.534	10	11.1	15	16.7	10	11.1	27	30.0	21	23.3	3	3.3	3	3.3
Students would have forgone the opportunity to make money in a paid position. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =3.48, <i>SD</i> =1.349	7	7.8	17	18.9	14	15.6	35	38.9	10	11.1	5	5.6	1	1.1
Students would have less energy. <i>n</i> =89, <i>M</i> =3.11, <i>SD</i> =1.426	13	14.4	19	21.1	21	23.3	23	25.6	9	10.0	2	2.2	2	2.2

CHAPTER V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

This study researched attitudes of faculty members at Rowan University towards service-learning. The survey was sent to 172 tenure-line faculty members, 50% of the total population of faculty at Rowan University, during the spring 2011 semester. Out of the 172 randomly selected subjects, 90 faculty members responded yielding a return rate of 52.33%. Each of the university's six academic colleges and one service college were represented in the survey's final sample. Faculty members' attitudes toward enhancement features of service-learning, student outcomes, institutional support, motivation for incorporating service-learning into courses, reasons for integrating service-learning into their curriculum, and service-learning integration experiences were all examined.

A 40-question survey instrument was distributed to the subjects via an e-mailed link to the online survey hosting site Surveymonkey.com. The survey collected information on demographics such as race, college, level of professorship, age, and gender. There were two questions based on experience with service-learning, followed by 11 items on faculty attitudes toward possible student outcomes associated with service-learning, 21 items on faculty attitudes of service-learning, and one item ranking the reasons for teaching a service-learning course.

Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) was used to analyze the collected data. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to analyze the survey items. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine if any significant correlations existed between the faculty demographics and their attitudes towards service-learning.

Discussion of the Findings

Research Question 1: What are the attitudes of selected faculty members at Rowan University towards service-learning?

Taken as a whole, the data for this research question suggest that faculty members generally agreed or strongly agreed with the statements within the first domain of student enhancement features of service-learning. This is consistent with what Carter (2004) found. Seventy percent of the subjects agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “service-learning can enhance my ability to communicate the core competencies of the subject matter I teach.” This is consistent with Carter who found that approximately 70% of her respondents agreed or strongly agreed with that statement. An additional 66.6% of the faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “when service is integrated in course work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better.” This is also consistent with Carter’s findings. She found that 20% of the subjects strongly agreed and over 50% agreed with the statement “when service is integrated in course work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better.”

Furthermore, 82.2% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “a service-learning project would help my students apply course knowledge to real world situations.” Just over half the participants (52.2%) agreed or strongly agreed with the

statement “teaching service-learning helps to define student’s personal strengths and weaknesses for faculty.” In addition, 73.4% of the subjects agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “teaching a service-learning course requires a change in teach orientation.” Faculty members generally disagreed or strongly disagreed (70%) with the statement “students learn more from a course when all time is spent in the classroom rather than doing service in the community.” Most of the subjects (71.1%) also disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement “service activities beyond the institution are a distraction and compete with essential academic work.” The previous two statements were not phrased as “enhancement features” but rather the opposite. Therefore in can be determined that most professors at Rowan agree that service-learning does not prohibit students from learning inside the classroom and it does not compete with essential academic work.

Within the second domain of faculty motivation toward service-learning integration the data show that most faculty (73.4%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that “service-learning is an important in faculty evaluation at this university.” This is different from Carter’s data. She found that 50% agreed or strongly agreed with service-learning being an important part of faculty evaluation. The difference between both data could be due to the fact that many of the faculty that responded to Carter’s study were from institutions that mandated service-learning for all students. Additionally, 80% of the subjects from Rowan responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement “service-learning provides the opportunity for faculty to communicate new ideas in a real work context.” Over 80% of the subjects from Carter’s

study agreed or strongly agreed with the idea that service-learning allows faculty members to communicate ideas in a real work context.

It is important to note that 67.8% of the subjects agreed or strongly agreed that they would like to implement service-learning into their classes, but only 32.2% felt adequately prepared to do so. Bulot and Johnson (2006) found that 97.5% of the faculty members that they surveyed stated that they would like to teach a service-learning course in the future but 54% said that institutional support for service-learning was a problem. Bulot and Johnson also found that 100% of their subjects stated that service-learning courses “took more time and effort than a traditional course.” In this study, the data showed that 80% of the faculty members agreed with the statement “teaching a service-learning takes more time and effort than a traditional course.”

Generally, faculty members disagreed or strongly disagreed with most of the statements within the domain of institutional support for service-learning. Only 25.5% of the subjects responded to the statement “Service expectations are clearly articulated in institutional and departmental tenure/promotion policies at this university,” with a response of “agree” or “strongly agree.” Carter (2004) had a slightly higher level of agreement with over 40% responding “agree” or “strongly agree.” This could be due to the fact that some of the faculty members included in her study were from institutions where there was a service-learning requirement.

Carter also found that 63% of her subjects agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “university administration recognizes service-learning as a scholarly contribution to the discipline.” I found that only 15.6% of the respondents agreed with

that statement. Again, this disparity could be due to the service requirement at some of the institutions where her study took place.

My findings were consistent with Carter's when it came to the level of agreement with the statement "Integrating service-learning offers an instructor released time and/or other incentives." She stated that most faculty members disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The same was true at Rowan. Most faculty members (78.9%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with that statement.

Most faculty members agreed or strongly agreed that "teaching a service-learning course enhances career opportunities" and offers them "positive recognition within the community," (61.1% and 55.5%, respectively). This is different from what Bauer et al. (2007) and Bulot and Johnson (2006) found. Bauer et al. stated that faculty did not display the most favorable attitudes towards the career benefits of service-learning. Bulot and Johnson (2006) found that 78% of their subjects said that they lacked recognition for their efforts in service-learning. However, my findings were consistent with Bulot and Johnson when it came to the financial resources. The data show that 68.9% of the faculty members disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "I have adequate financial resources in order to implement service-learning in my classroom." In Bulot and Johnson's study 81% stated that they lacked the necessary monetary support to conduct a proper service-learning project. Furthermore, just over half of the faculty members at Rowan stated that their department supports implementing service-learning into their courses while only 34.4% agreed or strongly agreed to the statement "the university supports implementing service-learning into my courses."

Research Question 2: What are the service-learning teaching experiences of selected faculty members at Rowan University?

Thirty-one (34.4%) faculty members stated that had implemented service-learning into their classrooms before while 59 (65.6%) stated that they had not implemented service-learning into their courses. Only 30 participants that answered the question: “how often do you implement service-learning into your courses?” The highest response rate of 15 subjects (16.7%) stated that they implemented service-learning “sporadically of the course of my career,” followed by “once a semester,” with 11 (12.2%) subjects, then “several time a semester,” with 2 (2.2%) subjects, and finally “I mandate a semester long service-learning program for my students,” also with 2 (2.2%) subjects.

Research Question 3: How do faculty members rank various reasons for incorporating service-learning into their classrooms at Rowan University?

According the data faculty ranked “personal commitment to the community” as the most important reason for incorporating service-learning into their classrooms. After that, the rankings were as follows: “personal gratification,” “professional development,” “try something new,” “join other colleagues in using this form of instruction,” “faculty incentives,” and finally “monetary rewards.”

Carter’s (2004) data suggest that the most important reason for incorporating service-learning into the classroom was also a personal commitment to the community (381 subjects ranked that as “most important). However her rankings after that differed slightly. The next most important reason was “professional development,” followed by “try something new,” then “join other colleagues in using this form of instruction,” and then “personal gratification.” The final two rankings matched-up once again, with

“faculty incentives” and “monetary rewards” completing the end of the rankings. A possible reason for the difference between the rankings at Rowan and the rankings from Carter’s study could again be that several of the institutions that her study was conducted at had a service-learning requirement for all students.

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between faculty demographics and attitudes towards service-learning?

According to the data there were some significant relationships between the faculty demographics and attitudes towards service-learning, but none above the moderate level. Those relationships are displayed within Table 4.8 in Chapter IV. Carter (2004) also found there to be significant relationships between demographic variables and faculty attitudes toward service learning. Her findings suggested that older, white males were less in favor of the student enhancement features (domain 1) of service-learning.

The strongest relationship, although still moderately inverse, was between the faculty members’ college and the statement “my department supports implementing service-learning into my courses,” (Pearson $r = -.378$, $p = .000$). Most professors (71.1%) in the College of Education agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, while most subjects (68.9%) from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences disagreed or strongly disagreed. Carter (2004) also found that those who taught in an education department reported higher levels of agreement with this statement. The data suggest that a faculty member’s academic discipline affects their attitudes toward service learning.

According to the data there is another moderate inverse relationship (Pearson $r = -.302$, $p = .005$) between college and the statement “when service is integrated in course

work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better.” Here, 90.4% of the faculty members within the College of Education agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, while nearly half (42.2%) of the faculty members within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. An overall look at the data suggest that those in the College of Education typically agreed with all of the student enhancement features of service-learning more-so than those in any other college. This is consistent with the previous research of Carter.

Another moderate inverse relationship is between the level of professorship and the statement “teaching a service-learning course takes more time and effort than a traditional course,” (Pearson $r = -.333, p = .002$). Thirteen percent (three respondents) of the assistant-level professors disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement while nearly double (25.9% or seven respondents) of the full-level professors disagreed or strongly disagreed. Only 8.8% (three respondents) of the associate-level faculty members disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

There was a direct moderate relationship between race and the statement “teaching a service-learning course results in a change in teaching orientation,” (Pearson $r = .347, p = .001$). For this correlation, only Whites and African Americans mostly agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Fifty-nine white subjects (85.5%) and three African Americans respondents (100%) agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Fifty percent or more of each of the remaining race groups (Asian / Pacific Islander- 66.6%, Hispanic / Latino- 50%, and multi-racial-100%) selected “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to this statement.

Carter (2004) only found statistical significance with the demographics of age, race, and sex. Neither the age demographic nor gender demographic had any statistical significance above the weak level at Rowan. Carter found that older, white males were less in favor of the student enhancement features of service-learning. She did not report of any statistical significance between race and the statement “teaching a service-learning course results in a change in teaching orientation.”

Research Question 5: What outcomes do selected faculty members associate with service-learning?

Out of the statements chosen from the CSAS to be a part of this study, Shiarella, McCarthy, and Tucker (1999) found that the highest mean score was for the statement “I would experience personal satisfaction knowing that I am helping others,” with a mean score of 6.24. That statement was followed by “I would be contributing to the betterment of the community,” with a mean of 5.89. (“I” was changed to “students” for the purposes of this study.) The next highest mean score for Shiarella et al. was 5.70 for “I would gain valuable experience for my (their) resume,” and “I would be meeting other people who enjoy community service.”

The data for Rowan were consistent here. The highest mean score was 5.67 for the statement “students would experience personal satisfaction knowing that they are helping others,” followed by the statement “students would be contributing to the betterment of the community,” with a mean of 5.66. “Students would be meeting other people who enjoy community service,” was the third highest mean with 5.58.

In the Shiarella et al. (1999) study, the lowest means were found for the following statements: “I would have less energy,” “I would have less time to spend with my

family,” and “I would have forgone the opportunity to make money in a paid position,” with mean scores of 3.62, 4.05, and 4.36, respectively. In my study, the subjects rated these statements with the lowest means as well. “Students would have less energy,” was the lowest mean of 3.11. That statement was followed by “students would have forgone the opportunity to make money in a paid position,” with a mean of 3.48 and “I would have less time to spend with my family,” had a mean of 3.62.

Conclusions

The results from this study somewhat confirm the previous research in this area. Faculty members typically agree with the student enhancement features and beneficial outcomes of service-learning such as students understanding course material better, students developing new skills, professors being able to better convey the core competencies for the subjects they teach, and students being able to apply course knowledge to real-world situations (Carter, 2004, Shiarella et al., 1999, & 2000). However, while the professors at Rowan recognize the benefits of service-learning, not very many have ever implemented service-learning projects into their courses. Even less professors have done so on a consistent basis.

Some of the data from this study confirm the previous studies when it comes to faculty motivation and institutional support. Some of these disparities between my data and that of previous studies may be due to the fact that some of the research was conducted at institutions where there was a service-learning requirement for all students. Therefore faculty members had more experience teaching service-learning courses and typically reported higher levels of institutional support for service-learning.

However, the data from Rowan did support Bulot and Johnson's (2006) findings that most faculty members want to incorporate service-learning into their classes but far less feel like they are adequately prepared to do so or have the necessary financial support. Generally, most Rowan faculty members felt that there was not a lot of institutional support or motivation to implement service-learning although many reported that they would like to do so anyhow.

The data collected from this study generally does not support the correlations found in past studies between demographic information and attitudes towards service-learning. This could be due to the fact that previous studies were conducted at some institutions where service-learning was a requirement.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on the data, findings, and conclusions of this study the following recommendations are made for future practice:

1. Faculty members should be made aware of the resources already available to them at their institutions, such as an office of service learning, or a coordinator for service-learning within their department or college.
2. Provide additional resources for faculty members such as handbooks, guides, or additional staff members to help integrate service-learning into the classroom.
3. Provide faculty incentives for those that incorporate service-learning into their classes, such as released-time and / or grants.
4. Clearly articulate service expectations and make service-learning an important part of faculty evaluation at the university.

5. Make service-learning a clear priority for the university. Articulate service-learning as a priority in the university mission statement, department curriculum guidelines and departmental mission statements.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further research are presented based upon the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. Repeat the study but broaden and enlarge the population sample to include faculty members at other institutions. Results could then be compared between institutions of various sizes, divisions, geographic locations, and other factors.
2. Broaden the scope of the study to include factors such as personal involvement with service outside of faculty members' obligations to the university.
3. Conduct follow-up interviews with selected subjects to provide richer answers to research questions.
4. Conduct a longitudinal study over the course of faculty members' careers to determine if their attitudes change over time.
5. Include both faculty and students in the study in order to be able to compare results between the two groups.

REFERENCES

- Albarracin, D., Johnson, B. T., & Zanna, M. P. (Eds.). (2005). *The handbook of attitudes*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 40(5), 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? *Liberal Education*, 79(4), 4-16.
- Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Bauer, E. H., Moskal, B., Gosink, J., Lucena, J., & Munoz, D. (2007). Faculty and student attitudes toward community service: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 96(2), 129-140.
- Bennet, J. (2009). The impact of mandatory community service and social support on urban high school seniors civic engagement orientations. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 37(3), 361-405.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, and satisfaction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brownell, J. E., & Swaner, L. E. (2009). High impact practices: Applying the learning outcomes literature to the development of successful campus programs. *Peer Review*, 11(2), 26-30.
- Bulot, J. J., & Johnson, C. J. (2006). Rewards and costs of faculty involvement in

- intergenerational service-learning. *Educational Gerontology*, 32, 633-645.
- Carter, C. G. (2004). Service-learning: An examination of community college faculty attitudes, integration of services, and institutional support. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD.
- Corporation for National Service. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions and communities, 1993-2000*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Dewey, J. (1900). *The school and society, the child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jonanovich.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1994). The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 327-339.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., & Scmiede, A. (1996). *Practitioner's guide to reflection in service learning: Student voices and reflections*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Godwin, D. R. (2002). Will they heed the call to service? A different look at the service-learning question. *Educational Horizons*, 81, 16-17.
- Henderson, A., Brown, S. D., Pancer, S. M., & Ellis-Hale, K., (2007). Mandated community service in high school and subsequent civic engagement: The case of the "double cohort" in Ontario, Canada. *Youth Adolescence*, 37, 849-860.
- Honnet, E. P., & Poulen, S. J. (1989). *Principles of Good Practice for Combining*

- Service and Learning, a Wingspread Special Report*. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation, Inc.
- Hou, S. (2010). Developing a faculty inventory measuring perceived service-learning benefits and barriers. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(2), 78-89.
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Jones, S. R., Segar, T. C., & Gasiorowski, A. L. (2008). "A double-edged sword:" College student perceptions of required high school service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(1), 5-17.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 66(2), 123-155.
- Kuh, G. D., Douglas, K., Lund, J., & Ramin-Gyurnek, R. (1994). *Student learning outside the classroom: Transcending artificial boundaries* (ASHE-ERIC High Education Report No. 8). Washington, DC: George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.
- Learn and Serve America: National Service Learning Clearinghouse. (n.d.). *What is service learning?* Retrieved from: <http://www.servicelearning.com>
- Metz, E., & Youniss, J. (2003). A demonstration that school-based required service does not deter-but heightens-volunteerism. *Political Science and Politics*, 36, 281-286.
- Metz, E., & Youniss, J. (2005). Longitudinal gains in civic development through school based required service. *Political Psychology*, 26, 413-437.
- Ord, J. (2009). Experiential leaning in youth work in the UK: A return to Dewey.

- International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 28(4), 493-511.
- Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2006). Self-regulation and the problem of human autonomy: Does psychology need choice, self-determination, and will? *Journal of Personality*, 74(6), 1557-1586.
- Rozycki, E. (1994). Values education or values confusion? *Educational Horizons*, 72, 111-113.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 221-279.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Howard, J. (1984). Helping and cooperation: A self-based motivational model. *Cooperation and Helping Behavior: Theories and Research*. 327-352.
- Shiarella, A., McCarthy, A., & Tucker, M. (1999, January). *Refinement of a Community Service Attitude Scale*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, San Antonio, Texas.
- Shiarella, A., McCarthy, A., & Tucker, M. (2000). Development and construct validity of scores on the community service attitudes scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(2), 286-300.
- Speck, B. W., & Hoppe, S. L. (2004). *Service-learning: History, theory, and issues*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of mandatory volunteerism on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science*, 10(1), 59-64.
- Welcome to Rowan University. (2008). Retrieved from:
<http://www.rowan.edu/subpages/about/>

APPENDIX A
Institutional Review Board Approval Letter



December 15, 2010

Rhiannon Napoli
340 Highland Ave.
Westville, NJ 08093

Dear Rhiannon Napoli:

In accordance with the University's IRB policies and 45 CFR 46, the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to inform you that the Rowan University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved your project:

IRB application number: 2011-064

Project Title: Service Learning: A Study of Faculty Attitudes at Rowan University

In accordance with federal law, this approval is effective for **one calendar year** from the date of this letter. If your research project extends beyond that date or if you need to make significant modifications to your study, you must notify the IRB immediately. Please reference the above-cited IRB application number in any future communications with our office regarding this research.

Please retain copies of consent forms for this research for three years after completion of the research.

If, during your research, you encounter any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, you must report this immediately to Dr. Harriet Hartman (hartman@rowan.edu or call 856-256-4500, ext. 3787) or contact Dr. Gautam Pillay, Associate Provost for Research (pillay@rowan.edu or call 856-256-5150).

If you have any administrative questions, please contact Karen Heiser (heiser@rowan.edu or 856-256-5150).

Sincerely,

Harriet Hartman, Ph.D.
Chair, Rowan University IRB

c: Burton Sisco, Educational Leadership, Education Hall

Office of Research
Bole Hall Annex
201 Mullica Hill Road
Glassboro, NJ 08028-1701

856-256-5150
856-256-4425 fax

APPENDIX B
Community Service Attitudes Scale

Appendix B

Community Service Participation Questionnaire

Please help us in our study by answering the following questions.

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male
3. Race:
☐ African-American (Non-Hispanic) ☐ Multi-Racial ☐ Other: _____
☐ Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ Native American
☐ Hispanic/Latino ☐ White (Non-Hispanic)
4. College Rank: ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐ Senior ☐ Graduate
5. Major: _____
6. Have you ever participated in unpaid community service projects? ☐ Yes ☐ No
7. If yes, how frequently do you engage in community service?
☐ once per year ☐ 2 – 4 times per year ☐ monthly ☐ weekly
8. Are you working (either full-time or part-time) while attending school? ☐ Yes ☐ No

We are trying to understand your willingness to donate your time regularly to a community service project. By **community service**, we mean a project in which you would volunteer at least twice a month for a couple of hours and use your skills and knowledge. In other words, this is more than just volunteering time stuffing envelopes or picking up trash. These types of community service projects require a long-term commitment (i.e., at least one semester) and offer you the opportunity to share you skills, as well as develop new ones. Examples include tutoring a child, organizing a fund-raising campaign, or designing a computer application for a non-profit organization.

Please answer the following questions about your feelings regarding community service projects using the definition provided previously. Some of the questions might appear similar, but each one measures a unique set of information. If some of the questions do not apply to you (e.g., you do not have a job), please skip those questions.

Now, pretend you are going to volunteer for a community service project sometime in the next year. Questions 9-20 ask you about possible outcomes associated with volunteering. Use the following scale to rate how likely you feel these outcomes are to occur.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Extremely unlikely	quite unlikely	slightly unlikely	neither likely nor unlikely	slightly likely	quite likely	extremely likely
9.	<input type="text"/>						
10.	<input type="text"/>						
11.	<input type="text"/>						
12.	<input type="text"/>						
13.	<input type="text"/>						
14.	<input type="text"/>						
15.	<input type="text"/>						
16.	<input type="text"/>						
17.	<input type="text"/>						
18.	<input type="text"/>						
19.	<input type="text"/>						
20.	<input type="text"/>						

Again, pretend you are going to volunteer for community service, described earlier, sometime in the next year. Use the following scale to rate how you feel about questions 21-50:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	strongly disagree	disagree	slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	slightly agree	agree	strongly agree
21.							
22.							
23.							
24.							
25.							
26.							
27.							
28.							
29.							
30.							
31.							
32.							
33.							
34.							
35.							
36.							
37.							
38.							
39.							
40.							
41.							
42.							
43.							
44.							
45.							
46.							
47.							
48.							
49.							
50.							

Almost done. Use the following scale to rate how you feel about questions 51-54:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly disagree	disagree	slightly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	slightly agree	agree	strongly agree

51. The more people who help, the better things will get.
52. There are people who have needs which are not being met.
53. My contribution to the community will make a real difference.
54. Would you seek out an opportunity to do community service in the next year?

Thank You –We Appreciate Your Taking the Time to Participate In Our Study!

APPENDIX C

Service-Learning: An Examination of Community College Faculty Attitudes, Integration of Services, and Institutional Support Survey Instrument

Service-Learning in the Community College Faculty Survey

For the purpose of this study, service-learning is defined as follows:

Name of Employing College _____

1. What is your racial background?

Black/African American _____
Caucasian/White _____
Other _____

2. What is your present academic rank?

3. What is your sex and age group?

4. How long have you taught at the community college level?
Number of years _____

A-2

5. During the past two years, have you engaged in any of the following activities?

	Yes	No
a. Performed service/volunteer work in the community.	_____	_____
b. Advised student groups involved in community service.	_____	_____
c. Taught a course that involved a service-learning component.	_____	_____
If yes, please indicate course title _____		

6. Please indicate whether the following exists at your college:

	Yes	No
a. Community service requirement for all students	_____	_____
b. Community Service requirement for students in your department	_____	_____
c. An office of community service/service-learning.	_____	_____

Section II: Faculty Perceptions

Please provide your perceptions of service-learning by responding to the following statements. Strongly Agree is ranked at Level 4. Place an "X" in the box that mostly indicates your level of agreement with each statement.

		Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
7.	Service-learning can enhance my ability to communicate the core competencies of the subject matter I teach.				
8.	When service is integrated in course work, students have a better opportunity to understand lectures and reading assignments in class.				
9.	Students learn more from a course when all time is spent in the classroom rather than doing service in the community.				
10.	Teaching a service-learning course results in a change in teaching orientation.				
11.	Service is important in faculty evaluation at this college.				
12.	Service expectations are clearly articulated in institutional and departmental tenure/promotion policies at this college.				

Section III: Faculty Attitudes

The next set of statements related to one's attitudes toward involvement in service-learning. Strongly Agree is ranked at Level 4. Place an "X" in the box that mostly indicates your level of agreement with each statement.

		Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
13.	Service-learning encourages and supports civic responsibility.				
14.	The service being done through the course benefits the community.				
15.	The college administration recognizes service-learning as a scholarly contribution to the discipline.				
16.	Service activity beyond the institution is a distraction and competes with essential academic work.				

17. To help understand the pedagogical, civic, and other bases of service-learning in the community college, rank the importance of the items below in reference to their relevance to service-learning. Rank each group separately. For each item, rank your order of importance, one (1) being the most important.

Group I

- a. Civic Responsibility _____
- b. Social Action _____
- c. Diversity _____
- d. Moral Development _____

Group II

- a. Career Exploration _____
- b. Critical Thinking Skills _____
- c. Self-Development _____
- d. Active/engaged learning _____

Section IV: Faculty Motivation

Please indicate the importance of the motivating factors for teaching a service-learning course. Very Important is rated as Level 4. Place an "X" in the box that corresponds to your response to the following statements.

		Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)
18.	Teaching service-learning helps to define students' personal strengths and weaknesses for faculty.				
19.	Teaching service-learning helps to clarify areas of focus for scholarships.				
20.	Teaching a service-learning course enhances career opportunities.				
21.	Service-learning provides the opportunity for faculty to communicate new ideas in a real world context.				
22.	Integrating service in the curriculum affords the instructor positive recognition within the college community.				
23.	Integrating service-learning offers an instructor released time and other incentives.				
24.	Participating in the community enhances leadership skills.				

25. Rank the following reasons for teaching a service-learning course in order of importance, #1 being the most important.

- a. Try something new _____
- b. Join other colleagues in using this form of instruction _____
- c. Faculty incentives _____
Personal gratification _____
Monetary rewards _____
- d. Professional Development _____
- e. Personal commitment to service to the community _____

APPENDIX D

Survey Instrument

Service-Learning Questionnaire

I am conducting a study on faculty attitudes of service-learning. The research project entitled "Service-Learning: A Study of Faculty Attitudes at Rowan University," is being conducted in partial fulfillment of my Master's degree in Higher Education Administration. If you wish to participate in this study, please complete the survey that appears below. Please do not put your name on this form since all responses will be kept anonymous. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to respond to any question or to not participate in the study as a whole with no penalty to you.

This survey instrument is based off of the *Community Service Attitudes Scale* (CSAS) that was created and validated by Shiarella, McCarthy, and Tucker (2000) and a survey instrument developed by Clara Giles Carter for a dissertation entitled "Service-Learning: An Examination of Community College Faculty Attitudes, Integration of Services, and Institutional Support." For the purposes of this study service-learning is a form of experiential education in which students take part in activities that deal with human and society needs together with planned opportunities purposely designed to encourage student learning and growth (Jacoby, 1996).

If you have any questions, my name and contact information appear below:

Rhiannon Napoli
napoli@rowan.edu
(856) 256-4187

Faculty Advisor:
Dr. Burton Sisco, Ed.D.
Educational Leadership
sisco@rowan.edu
(856) 256-3717

Please answer the following questions.

1. Age: ☐ 22-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41-50 ☐ 51-60 ☐ 61-70 ☐ 71 & over
2. Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male ☐ Transgender ☐ Choose not to disclose
3. Race:
☐ African-American (Non-Hispanic) ☐ Multi-Racial ☐ Other: _____
☐ Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ Native American
☐ Hispanic/Latino ☐ White (Non-Hispanic)
4. Level of Professorship: ☐ Assistant ☐ Associate ☐ Full
5. College: ☐ Business ☐ Communication ☐ Education ☐ Engineering ☐ Fine & Performing Arts
☐ Liberal Arts & Sciences ☐ College of Graduate and Continuing Studies
6. Have you ever implemented service-learning activities into you classroom? ☐ Yes ☐ No
7. If so, how often? ☐ Sporadically over the course of my career
☐ Once a semester
☐ Several times a semester
☐ I mandate a semester long service-learning program for my students
☐ Other

Questions 8-19 ask about possible outcomes associated with service-learning that students may experience. Use the following scale to rate how likely you feel these outcomes are to occur if a student participates in service-learning.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely unlikely	quite unlikely	slightly unlikely	neither likely nor unlikely	slightly likely	quite likely	extremely likely

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 8. | | Students would be contributing to the betterment of the community. |
| 9. | | Students would experience personal satisfaction knowing that they are helping others. |
| 10. | | Students would be meeting other people who enjoy community service. |
| 11. | | Students would be developing new skills. |
| 12. | | Students would make valuable contacts for their professional careers. |
| 13. | | Students would gain valuable experience for their resume. |
| 14. | | Students would have less time for their schoolwork. |
| 15. | | Students would have forgone the opportunity to make money in a paid position. |
| 16. | | Students would have less energy. |
| 17. | | Students would have less time to work. |
| 18. | | Students would have less free time. |
| 19. | | Students would have less time to spend with their families. |

Questions 20-41 address faculty attitudes surrounding implementing service-learning into the classroom. Please use the following scale for questions 19-40:

1	2	3	4
strongly disagree	disagree	agree	strongly agree

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 20. | | Service-learning can enhance my ability to communicate the core competencies of the subject matter I teach. |
| 21. | | When service is integrated in course work, students understand lectures and reading assignments in class better. |
| 22. | | Students learn more from a course when all time is spent in the classroom rather than doing service in the community. |
| 23. | | Teaching a service-learning course results in a change in teaching orientation. |
| 24. | | Service-learning is important in faculty evaluation at this university. |
| 25. | | Service expectations are clearly articulated in institutional and departmental tenure/promotion policies at this university. |
| 26. | | University administration recognizes service-learning as a scholarly contribution to the discipline. |
| 27. | | Service activities beyond the institutions (i.e. in the community) are a distraction and competes with essential academic work. |

28.	<input type="text"/>	Teaching service-learning helps to define students' personal strengths and weaknesses for faculty.
29.	<input type="text"/>	Teaching a service-learning course enhances career opportunities.
30.	<input type="text"/>	Service-learning provides the opportunity for faculty to communicate new ideas in a real work context.
31.	<input type="text"/>	Integrating service in the curriculum affords the instructor positive recognition within the university community.
32.	<input type="text"/>	Integrating service-learning offers an instructor released time and/or other incentives.
33.	<input type="text"/>	Participating in the community enhances my leadership skills.
34.	<input type="text"/>	Teaching a service-learning course takes more time and effort than a traditional course.
35.	<input type="text"/>	I would like to implement service-learning into my courses.
36.	<input type="text"/>	I have adequate financial resources in order implement service-learning in my classroom.
37.	<input type="text"/>	My department supports implementing service-learning into my courses.
38.	<input type="text"/>	The university supports implementing service-learning into my courses.
39.	<input type="text"/>	I feel adequately prepared to implement service-learning into my courses.
40.	<input type="text"/>	A service-learning project would help my students apply course knowledge to "real world" situations.

41. Please rank the following reasons for teaching a service-learning course in order of importance, #1 being the most important.

- ___ Try something new
- ___ Join other colleagues in using this form of instruction
- ___ Faculty incentives
- ___ Personal gratification
- ___ Monetary rewards
- ___ Professional development
- ___ Personal commitment to service to the community

Thank You!